

Date: Thu, 14 Jul 94 04:30:19 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #308  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Thu, 14 Jul 94                      Volume 94 : Issue    308

Today's Topics:

Emergency transmissions  
Re: CW ... My view.  
VK Licence

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.  
-----

Date: Wed, 13 Jul 94 03:35:15 GMT  
From: netcomsv!netcomsv!skyld!jangus@decwrl.dec.com  
Subject: Emergency transmissions  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

More food for the armchair lawyers to fight over.

If you're on a commercial airline, and you have a life threatening  
emergency, can you use your HT to request help? Can you use it in  
the commercial aircraft band is so modified?

73 es GE from Jeff

Amateur: WA6FWI@WA6FWI.#SOCA.CA.USA.NOAM	"You have a flair for adding
Internet: jangus@skyld.grendel.com	a fanciful dimension to any
US Mail: PO Box 4425 Carson, CA 90749	story."
Phone: 1 (310) 324-6080	Peking Noodle Co.



Hate "Green Card Lottery"? Want to help curb ignorant crossposting on Usenet?  
E-mail ckeroack@hamp.hampshire.edu for more information, or read news.groups.

-----  
Date: Wed, 13 Jul 1994 13:43:38 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!wotan.compaq.com!  
twisto.eng.hou.compaq.com!news@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Re: CW ... My view.  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>>>I support your right to use CW if you wish. I will not ask that it be  
>>>banned.

>>>

>>Decent of you.

>

>Yes, too bad the pro-cw-testing group are not as decent. Forcing someone  
>to learn one mode over another when no single mode is the end all to RF  
>is, plainly, silly.

>

>Dan

>--

Exactly my point. No single mode is an end all. Therefore we should strive to  
learn as many as possible. Many people considered the Advanced test to be  
the hardest of all the exams, mostly because it covered the more bizarre modes:  
RTTY et. al., SSTV, ATV, and fax. No surprise that some people consider the  
CW test to be the most difficult, but it must be included to provide any operator  
with a well rounded expertise in all the available modes.

It is surprising how many ops on VHF SSB can't switch over to CW to make a QSO  
during weak signal conditions. That's a shame.

Earl Morse

KZ8E

KZ8E@bangate.compaq.com

"If you don't know the code you're only getting half a band."

-----  
Date: 13 Jul 1994 09:00:52 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!swrinde!pipex!  
warwick!news.shef.ac.uk!stoat5!me2ggc@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: VK Licence  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I currently hold a VK (restricted) licence and it will run out by the end of  
August 94. I am no longer residing in Sydney but can anyone tell me if I can  
still continue to hold this licence, even if I am not in Aust. anymore?



Thanks.

Guan CHEW (VK2XZX)  
The University of Sheffield,  
England.

e-mail: g.g.chew@sheffield.ac.uk

-----  
Date: Wed, 13 Jul 1994 11:27:17 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!blanket.mitre.org!world!drt@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Jul4.215649.7590@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,  
<070694023831Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>, <1994Jul12.163536.884@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>  
Subject : Re: Existing regulations limit our advancement.

Gary Coffman (gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us) wrote:

: Now this wouldn't mean much \*except\* that page 1-12 says that the  
: interpretations presented in the book are FCC approved interpretations  
: of the rules, and are backed by original intent during rulemaking and  
: by case law.

Oh, dear. Reverse autopatch is in deep trouble. That "FCC approved"  
stuff is still in the book (on page 1-10), and page 14-9 has the following:

"No unlicensed person may initiate an amateur transmission. Incoming  
calls, as previously mentioned, must be answered and screened off the  
air by the control operator (who must be a licensed amateur) to ensure  
rule compliance. The use of a reverse autopatch is permitted only  
under very limited condition."

I ignored this because I figured that is was merely ARRL opinion and I  
couldn't find any "answered and screened" language in the actual  
rules, only a responsibility to somehow insure rules compliance. If  
actual FCC interpretation is behind that paragraph, the "telemetry"  
excuse is out of court and reverse patches are nearly useless after  
all.

-drt

-----  
David R. Tucker      KG2S              8P9CL              drt@world.std.com



-----  
Date: 13 Jul 1994 11:17:53 -0400  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!news.intercon.com!  
news1.digex.net!digex.net!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <378@doghouse.win.net>, <2vsae6\$fsv@chnews.intel.com>,  
<071294174505Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>  
Subject : Re: Does CW as a pre-req REALLY Work?

If the code requirement is removed but a REAL technical test is used, I'm afraid we'd have a new group of lids unable to copy, let alone send (unless they're using their computers, and we know how well computers copy, don't we?) Anyway, I'll always favor a minimum CW requirement at the very least.

Andy N3LCW, CW mobile...

-----  
Date: 13 Jul 1994 11:18:28 -0400  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!news.intercon.com!  
news1.digex.net!digex.net!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <Csrn6B.Ant@news.hawaii.edu>, <2vuhl0\$9mr@chnews.intel.com>,  
<CsuFws.L8u@news.Hawaii.Edu>mai  
Subject : Re: Does CW as a pre-req

In article <CsuFws.L8u@news.Hawaii.Edu>, Jeffrey Herman wrote:  
> In article <2vuhl0\$9mr@chnews.intel.com> CecilMoore@delphi.com writes:  
>  
> But Cec, we don't see half of all transportation being conducted via  
> horses. But that IS the case with CW, where about half of all QSO's  
> on HF are conducted using code. Count 'em! And CW-only radios are  
> selling briskly (reference: QRP newsgroup).  
>  
>...  
> Jeff NH6IL  
>

CW, the mode that all international intelligence agencies view as the most effective comm method.

Andy

-----



Date: 13 Jul 1994 11:18:12 -0400  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!news.intercon.com!  
news1.digex.net!digex.net!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <40.7746.2426@channel1.com>, <Csrn6B.Ant@news.hawaii.edu>,  
<2vuh10\$9mr@chnews.intel.com>.digex.n  
Subject : Re: Does CW as a pre-req

In article <2vuh10\$9mr@chnews.intel.com>, CecilMoore@delphi.c wrote:

>  
> You have hit the nail on the head as to what is wrong with ham radio today.  
> ...too much history and not enough science, engineering, and mathematics.  
> Come on, Jeff, we are approaching the 21st century. Morse code is to  
> radio what horses are to transportation.  
>  
> 73, KG7BK, OOTC, CecilMoore@delphi.com  
>

Everyone's screaming about CW being ancient compared to digital; what the  
heck is CW anyway, carrier-ON, carrier-OFF, that's as digital as you're  
going to get. I think someone missed the technical point of what true  
digital communications is...perhaps add advanced technology to a  
tried and tested mode; synchronous CW anyone?

Andy N3LCW

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #308

\*\*\*\*\*